Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1328VA-1 for Richmond Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Richmond Public Schools (RPS) proposes a comprehensive and coherent RTTTD reform effort which clearly builds on multiple years of attention to the four core educational assurance areas. The current status of the LEA's efforts to improve student achievement is well described in this section Specifically, they reference that there has since 2005, been "significant" ongoing reform work designed to improve teaching and learning, focused on turning around persistently low achieving schools. Additionally, the applicant provides a detailed analysis of the efforts and successes in the four core educational assurance areas.

A credible, high quality approach to the goals is articulated.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicants approach to implementing its reform proposal is based in an analysis of the LEAs experience with improvement efforts, specifically a review of school level performance data. This revealed areas of high need. Readiness and capacity to implement were also considered. The pilot schools were chosen as a result of this analysis of need, readiness and capacity.

The study *"The Forgotten Middle"* was influential in choosing the middle schools (coupled with their high schools) for intervention. Using evidenced based research as part of the selection process is commendable.

Participating pilot schools, as well as schools involved as scaling occurs, and numbers of participating students in all subgroups are delineated.

All criteria for this section are met.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There is no narrative provided specifically for (A) (3), although there is a narrative labeled (A) (2) and a graphic labeled (A) (4). In the first pages of the proposal the applicant states a theory of change for creating a Personalized Learning System that is focused on middle and high school students. The overall narrative does include components of a high quality plan including broadly applying "gifted education strategies," developing a parent "university" and infusing STEM throughout the middle school curriculum.

A Logic Model is referenced frequently in the RPS Learning Plan and in the opening sections of the proposal.

The Budget Narrative attached presents a thoughtful, viable, staged plan for four years of scaling up one component of the plan. This reviewer would have liked to have seen the other components of the plan developed more fully and in the mode of this attachment.

Absence of a specific (A)(3) narrative section and insufficient information as to the "how" of reaching goals accounts for the score.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A narrative of explanation is not included for (A) (4). The graphic displayed shows a seven year projection of highly ambitious annual targets for all subgroups. There is no indication of State ESEA targets. There is no detail provided for why the applicant believes that 90% of (almost all) students will achieve at grade level or the rationale for assuming that the achievement gap for all subgroups in Reading, Writing and Mathematics will be reduced to to 0%. The reviewer does not consider this a realistically achievable goal.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

RPS has not advanced student achievement according to statements in this section. The narrative speaks to declines in Math achievement and gaps for all subgroups against the comparison group that are "large and persistent across grade levels and subject area." Additionally, graduation rates for RPS students are below state average and college enrollment is considered "very low." The applicant noted the need to pay closer attention to the "Black achievement gap."

The reform initiatives are ambitious and have the potential, if implemented well and adopted widely, for raising student achievement, high school graduation rates and college enrollment.

There is no specific reference in this section to persisitently lowest achieving/performing schools or to making data available to students, educators and parents as per (B)(1) (b-c).

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal describes multiple ways of communicating to various publics concerning district financial information. Various documents that provide all interested stakeholders with annual budgets, financial reports regarding state and local resources and expenditures at the school level are referenced. A link is provided in the proposal potentially to these financial reports. RTTT protocol does not encourage reviewers to peruse these links.

Inclusion in the Appendix of sample pages of these reports would be helpful.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that "Richmond Public Schools has sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the proposed projects as described in the submitted application." A letter of support from the DOE is referenced as well. This letter suggests some cautions going forward with the application.

Citations of relevant policy and descriptions of past DOE support would add supportive documentation to the narrative.

A statement that "there is agreement and consensus among our stakeholders" for the proposed reforms is not well supported by the documentation provided.The Union President did sign the Application Assurance, however, this reviewer found only three letters of support for the grant proposal recommendations. None of these were from RPS educators, parents or students. Absent such support this reviewer is not convinced that the presented plans will ultimately be successful.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Established protocols in relation to RPS's Balanced Scorecard (BSC) approach to school improvement are referenced in this section. However neither the body of the proposal nor any information provided in the Appendix explains or describes the BSC process. Nor does the referenced Strategic Planning Process support the narrative comment about the development "process involving significant participation by parents and community stakeholders."

"A positive response throughout the district" to the reform plans is noted in the narrative. The inclusion of meeting agendas, minutes, memos to and from staff, etc. would provide support for this statement. Most importantly, a broad range of supportive letters are needed.

Although there are Collaboration and Partnership Information forms attached this reviewer hesitates to conclude that these are letters of support. As noted in comments for (B) (3) only three letters of support from stakeholders were found in the Appendix. This does not meet the standard criterion (B) (b) (4) above.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

There is no explication of a plan to assess current conditions for implementing personalized learning environments. However, "a preliminary assessment" of RFP's capacity to successfully implement the proposed grant projects revealed that there are only "pockets" of personalized learning and teaching in the district. These "pockets" are found in several small, non-traditional high schools within the district. These schools have a "community based" structure and a self-paced curriculum to meet the needs of challenged students. RPS lists the conditions that are nurtured in these schools but does not specifically acknowledge them as gaps in other schools.

.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

RPS's proposal articulates a high quality plan designed to address personalized learning. The plan is guided by analysis of the LEAs experiences to date and the research study *"The Forgotten Middle*." Grant activities and goals are focused primarily on the needs of middle school students while paving the road to college and career readiness through the high school years. Each of the criterion in (C) (1) is substantively addressed. RTTT grant goals build upon the district's previous work in several areas, as confirmed by the Balanced Score Card presented in the Appendix to the proposal.

The narrative demonstrates district understanding of the personal and developmental needs of middle age students. These are addressed throughout this section, inclusive of multiple efforts to engage parents, alignment of after school programming with academic pursuits, and allowing for student voice and choice. However, the needs of identified students with disabilities is less fully addressed.

A Learning Plan graphic in this section delineates responsibilities and a timeline for goal achievement. RPS's Chief Academic Officer will provide project oversight.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A candid assessment of the district's current status in meeting the selection criteria is presented. The proposed plan is of high quality in several but not all areas. The plans going forward are commended for being based upon the LEAs past and current experiences with improvement of teaching and learning.

The district, by 2013-2014, as per state mandate, will institute an evaluation system that is linked to student achievement. The narrative notes that "RPS is developing a more robust evaluation for teachers and principals through the Teacher Incentive Fund Grant. This pilot involves nine schools where teachers are encouraged to invest in professional learning communities. Teachers will receive compensation based upon analysis of student achievement."

There is insufficient attention given in this narrative to providing administrators/leaders with the professional development they will need. Well beyond building instructional leadership these administrators will need support in meeting multiple challenges related to the various new expectations placed on teachers and the school culture.

Scale will be achieved through an assessment of the nine school pilot implementation. Based on evaluation of the pilot, adjustments will be made and the project will be scaled across all schools.

There is a plan proposed, although not fully articulated beyond recruitment strategies, for addressing inequities in identified schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**12**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA is organized to facilitate personalized learning with the Chief Academic Officer overseeing and monitoring project implementation and ensuring school leaders have the necessary flexibility and autonomy. The role of the superintendent and support of the Board are not mentioned in this section.

Students are, according to the narrative, currently provided with opportunities to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. This statement presumes that the State supports these policies.

The proposal states that "Richmond Public Schools offers a continuum of services for ESL students and those with disabilities and such that they have access to the general education curriculum and are able to make progress toward their IEP goals. However, RPS has not been able to consistently meet or exceed state targets in the areas of graduation and transition."

This reviewer's understanding of the current flexibility provided to schools and students would be enhanced by policy attachments, meetings of minutes, etc. or letters of support that reference this status. Supportive state policies would also be helpful if cited or included in the appendix.

A less than perfect score is noted for this section because of the lack of supporting documentation for information provided in the narrative.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While support in RPS for the personalized learning system is noted, the applicant also suggests that improvement of the infrastructure is essential. A significant investment, independent of the RTTT-D grant dollars, has been made to "rectify this situation with a purchase of Student Data Management Systems (SDMS) to be installed by June 2013." This is anticipated to make data systems inter operable. A proposed RTTT project will enhance student and parent portals and provide electronic learning devices. Students, parents and educators will be provided training.

This appears to be supported in the budget that pertains to coaching. Other components are not fully developed and there are no attachments referenced in support of this briefly addressed portion of the proposal.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**12**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal states that a "continuous improvement plan for the RPS RTTT grant will use several methods of data collection and analysis to help inform decision-making. Data related to each of the identified performance measures will be collected on a quarterly basis and shared with key decision-making groups for analysis and reflection." There will also be external data analysis through a contractual relationship with a university research consortium.

There is scant information concerning how mid-course corrections to the program will be made once the information need for analysis is collected.

There are statements of intent to share publicly but no details on how this will occur are provided.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is no section of the proposal distinctly labeled E2 and no focused part of the narrative that addresses in sufficient detail

"strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders." There is however a statement in the overall narrative for (E) that notes that data collected through performance evaluation will be used " to inform program stakeholders, program funders and the general public about the use and impact of federal grant funds."

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A rationale is provided for each indicator as is a general narrative description of how and how often progress toward each goal will be tracked. Data gathered "may" be used to inform program refinements. Particulars are not provided beyond a general statement of intent.

The chart provided by the applicant for this section is incomplete as only one performance measure is charted re: annual targets. The guidance for this response notes that "annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures" aare to be provided.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A focused (E) (4 narrative is not presented. The reviewer gleaned from the narrative under (E) that both an internal and external data analysis are planned. A University research consortium will be consulting. This performance monitoring system will be used to measure program effectiveness noting especially "(1) trends over time, (2) comparison among units (e.g. schools, programs within schools), (3) comparison against locally-developed performance targets, and (4) comparison with external benchmarks such as state and national averages. This data will be shared with program stakeholders, funders and the general public.

Plans for evaluation appear to be of high quality.

.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A completed Overall Budget Summary for this grant is not included in the document. Neither the budget nor the budget narrative identifies the source(s) of funds that will support the project beyond the RTTT funds. There is, in the Narrative, an explication of expenditures over the four year grant period for only one dimension of the program.

Given the absence of appropriate documentation this reviewer's score is based only upon a review of the budget. However, It is not possible, absent detailed calculations, for this reviewer to determine if the budget is in fact reasonable and sufficient to support the applicant's proposal.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Should Richmond Public Schools receive the RTTTD grant, RPS's Economic & Community Development Team will serve as a steering committee. They will identify a "work group" to develop strategies for potential financial support for a three year continuance of the grant program. To date "business and community partners have responded to the superintendent's call for demonstrated support of Richmond schools. These partners will help sustain our efforts, especially in the Middle School Renaissance Program."

The proposal does well to recognize and delineate several factors needed for sustainability of the project.

Several of these factors do appear to be in place including a limited list of partners. There are also letters from various entities indicating what appears to be their "estimate" of *"cash services as a dollar amount"* and *"total value of in-kind services as a dollar amount."* There is no accompanying narrative that explains these letters to the reader. Nor could this reviewer locate in the documents an Overall Budget Summary Page. Therefore the total of funds from other sources that might sustain this project are not discernable.

In (B) (3) the applicant notes that "the proposed projects are designed for sustainability and will not create stand- alone, niche programs, interventions or maintain the status- quo." This reviewer does not find sufficient support for that assertion in the budget section of the proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Communities in Schools of Richmond (CIS) has partnered with RPS for over 16 years. They coordinate services that impact schools, students and communities. The Competitive Preference Priority is proposing an expansion of CIS in the LEA. CIS's holistic approach to providing social, emotional and developmental supports to school age children is positively acknowledged nationally and is currently in 30 RPS schools.

The proposal establishes ambitious goals for this effort and globally identifies data collection processes as a means to monitor and adjust services and "annual plans to address school level prevention and student intervention."

The applicant proposes expanding CIS to the middle schools. Whether services are going to be expanded to one or several middle schools is not clear.

This section of the proposal, is somewhat fragmented and fails to address all the selection criteria required. It is scored in the high mid-range, in spite ot the deficits in this section, because CIS is a proven way to systemically support children's needs resulting in improved academic outcomes.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This proposal is centered around changing the model of teaching and learning in the district. Throughout, the applicant proposes to approach instruction for ALL middle and high school students using a Personalized Learning System which connects instruction to college and career readiness. The application is focused on personalizing learning to improve educational outcomes.

Total	210	150

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1328VA-2 for Richmond Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Richmond Public School (RPS) begins its strong visioning of their application by reviewing how the district is addressing the four assurances of (1) Standards and Assessment, (2) Data Systems, (3) Effective teachers and Principals, and (4) Turnaround school efforts.

RPS developed a statement of mission for the schools that will participate. RPS acknowlededged that the mission is not accomplished due to 20 schools in need of improvement.

1. RPS states that it has addressed the assurance related to standards and assessments by adopted college and career ready standards and is implementing The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL), which is the academic achievement test of Virginia.

2. They report that they also have addressed the development of data systems by utilizing two School Information Systems to measure student growth. One is designated for elementary school data and the other for secondary schools. However they acknowledge that the two systems are outdated.

3. The third assurance related to effective teachers and principals was addressed by RPS as it claims that a series of teacher initiatives including personalized learning environments achieved this purpose. However RPS did not fully explain a systematic approach that these initiatives represented. Further explanation was needed on developing training for personalized learning and associated strategies.

4. RPS points to its efforts with the fourth assurance of Turnaround schools by pointing the reduction of schools listed as AYP. However they continue to have schools requiring improvement largely due they state to new students entering the system.

RPS provided most of the elements of a high quality vision for its plan.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a).RPS identified the stakeholders who were involved in the selection RPS discussed the rationale for a process but did not clarify sufficiently the process for selection.

(b). The listing of the selected schools and all other essential data including participating students was adequately provided.

(c). Participation criteria was articulated.

The Plan needed further clarification of the rationale for the process of school selection

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

No information found in (A)(3)

However a review of other parts of the application provide the necessary and reasonable description of how the plan was conceptualized and supports district wide change.

1. The recent attachments provided contain a description of model based on the UDL (Universal Design for Learning).

2. It was conceptually compatible with the RTT reform model "Personalized Learning Environment as both are premised on the self-actualizing aspect of learning.

3. Other parts of the plan did not fully explain how it will scale up into districtwide change behond the participating schools such as K-5

The lack of response for (A)(3) diminished the reform quality of their proposed change.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

 a. RPS has goals that are attainable, for most, but likely not for all. Summative assessments showed improved student learning and performance with increased equity. The data tables provided by RPS depict the achievement gaps based on performances on the Virginia Standards of Learning Tests. RPS disaggregates the goal matrices by subgroups. The RTT 4 yr end goal is very ambitious (90%) from the following baselines (Black 66%, White 89%, Hispanic 74%, LEP 63%, Econ Dis 65%, SWD 55%.

b. Achievement Gap.: the RPS follows those goals with a table that describes an overreach of goals for narrowing the achievement gap declaring that the gap will be non-existent in four years. It is questionable that the gap can be eliminated within four years. ESEA targets needed to be further discussed.

c. Graduation Rates: Graduation rates have goals of 80% for all groups. However certain subgroups (LEP/SWD) have tremendous gaps and it may be an overreach.

d. College: As for postsecondary goals, the gain also appears to be a reasonable projection but given new data they could adjust these higher.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Richmond's documentation of past student learning did not provide the 4 year window. The appendices provide a table on SOL (Standards of Learning) that reports data for those three years instead of the two that this section states.

1. Summative assessments showing leveled performances with others dropping below state average performances. However, the performances over the past three years show performances of more than 50% proficiency in reading and math.

2. Graduation rates were well below state averages, particularly for Black students.

3. College enrollment did not meet their expectations.

1. The data shows some downward trend in performance but over the past three years the average performances were above 50% proficiency.

2. The District did show a record of success but not for 4 years

Richmonds partial record of success diminishes the quality of this section.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Richmond provides the necessary documentation that demonstrates its stakeholder transparency with respect to the information requested.

1. The information is stated to be on their website,

2. The district school board budget such as salaries and other costs are referenced by page number, without evidence such as a sample of that transparency

3. The information is provided in public hearings in the process of budget approval

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Richmond application makes a statement that there exists the necessary autonomy and flexibility

The conditions of autonomy were not sufficiently explained to ensure that a reform project to develop personalized learning environments was possible.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative provided sketchy information regarding the full nature on how stakeholders were collectively engaged in proposal development. There was evidence of engagement and there is support, but actual letters of support were few. The application did not describe how external stakeholders were engaged in this proposal. Other attachments did not necessarily represent support for the project but rather support for previous or ongoing involvement with the District. RPS submitted a letter of support from REA indicating document of support for the project.

RPS needed to demonstrate more concretely, the level of awareness, engagement in the development process, and more letters of support

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The plan provides an analysis of current efforts compared to the needs and gaps.

1.The Plan is orginally conceptualized as a continuation of a previous reform proposal "The New Direction-Developing the Whole Person".
2.Now the concrete representation of that first start is the elaboration of reform premised on the UDL model of learning and scales the model into a framework for a systems wide transformation to Personalized Learning.
3. There is extensive structure and processes for the objectives of the project. Activities and participant roles are delineated.
4. The appendix comprehensively provides the data documenting the needs and the gaps that pervade the whole of the District.
5. The gaps are portrayed also in (A) (4) for reading and math.
6. There are successes with certain subgroups, but the success is not always sustained in subsequent years. The graduation rates of 59% for Blacks, 55% for Hispanics, 37% for LEPs, etc are considered to be an area of high need and part of the Project's goals.
RPS provided the necessary analysis of need and the gaps existing within their student population.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Richmond explains in the narrative and in the appendices, the model and the instructional strategies:

1. All stakeholders are identified in the learning process for PLE to produce a balanced approach to systems change.
2. The Plan links the reform model to the continued mastery of the college and career ready standards.
3. The ongoing feedback for continuously improving and retargeting are adequately explained.
4. The utilization of technology, designated as 21st Century Digital Learning & Teaching, to generate the personalized self-actualized nature of PLE is stressed sufficiently.

5. Students requiring acccommodations (SWD) and Limited English proficient students have their needs addressed within the program. However, the explanation of how to most effectively integrate PLE with an IEP's directed approach must still be further developed.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) RPS did not provide sufficient information or explanation of (a)(i) to (a)

1. Training plans are contained within the Plan that encompass internal and external participants with the essential training in PLE present. The substance of the plans are viewed in the attachments and in prior sections.

2. The appendix contains a multi-year plan that includes specific objectives and activities related to the provision of resources and tools. They have a full explanation of their interoperable data plan that will contain all key datapoints.

3. The plan contains complete description of the evaluation plan, which now mandates academic factors as part of the teacher evaluation. The Plan provides for a multi-year activities to train and evaluate staff to ensure effectivenes at a higher level.

4. The applicant did not adequately describe a comprehensive high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The Plan provides substantive information on organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice), to provide support and services to all participating schools (as defined in this notice); The chief Academic OffIcer and all administrative staff have described roles in the Plan that provide the necessary support.

(b) The Plan provides an extensive description of the roles played by school leadership teams in participating schools. Explicit roles are adequately described in the Master Plan including their training into roles, responsibilities, activities.

(c) The plan has a limited approach to "mastery" based earning of credit. It relies on dual enrollment elements, an ACA for earning college credit and taking Standards of Learning tests. It does not refer to the earning of high school credit for courses taken, e.g, English, math, science, etc.

(d) The Plan does not describe adequately how standards mastery will be tested multiple times other than the 3 times that SOL can be taken.

(e) The Plan describes the learning resources and instructional practices students, including students with disabilities and English learners. The Plan highlights the key elements of the resources and strategies, particularly for SWD and LEP students. Their participation could have been developed further

There is sufficient information to document a quality effort for LEA support of the project.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The Plan provided details of stakeholder access throughout the plan to resources.

(b) The Plan describes the availability of support and involvement in key parts of the plan.

(c) The current and future information technology systems the Plan intends on using, will adequatelhy allow parents and students to use an interoperable data system for all of their data and information needs.

(d) The Plan presents their approach to an interoperable data systems for all the data and commjnication needs

The Plan has a good start on developing the infrastructure and exhibits good quality for their effort.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Plan provides a complete set of strategies for continuous improvement:

a) The continuous improvement plan is evident in various activities and timelines. The Plan identifies specific opportunities to develop the process and structure of continuous improvement. Assessment by all stakeholders is specified. The opportunities for all stakeholder feedback needed to be clarified.

Key elements include: Outcome-focused, Timely and actionable data, stakeholder engagement, valueadding.

An specific outline of the method for CIP will generate internal and external information for analyses. Engagement of all stakeholders in the process could have been developed further.

Sound performance measures are listed, with additional measures proposed.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A narrative was not provided for E2. So this limited the opportunity for the Plan to explain coherently ongoing communication and the degree to which engagement of all stakeholders were realized.

Richmond extends its systematic approach to the Plan by describing their process of engagement through a specific localized model of communication:

1.. Richmond will use the stakeholder group VCU/MERC as a primary vehicle to center its internal and external communications

2. Rather than list of stakeholder engagements, they embed the engagements an evaluational purpose, e.g. descriptive and comparative evaluations within the plan.

Richmond needed to present a more coherent view of their process of communication and engagement.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(a) RPS explained the rationale of each of the performance measures (PM), distinguishing between the first four and the rationale for the other nine.

(b) The indicator information would generate appropriate information that would lead to analysis, evaluation and action. Pm1-pm4 are concrete data related to whole group and subgroup participation with effective teachersand principals; on track career indicators; FAFSA completion rates. PM5-PM 13 differ in nature, but are quantifiable and related to the goals of accelerated academic achievement, gap closure, graduation rate, and college. However, the

(c) RPS states that a formative review will be conducted to gauge the sufficiency of the measures.

However, the   presentation of each of the performances did not adequately delilneate the measurable degree to which those performance goals were *ambitious yet achievable.*

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

RPS describes a comprehensive plan for examining the program so that it continuously improves the plan:

1. It describes an evaluation plan and utilizes the performances indicators to provide the information necessary to determine success.

2. In the Project Management description explains, through the use of a Balanced Scorecard a structure and process. However a fuller explanatio of the Balanced scorecard would have been informative

3. It will view various indicators of project implementation, linking the fiscal information of expenditures to the activities.

4. It does not provide a separate narrative to re-emphasize the effort to continuously improve.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

RSP has created a comprehensive budget that is intended on providing human and material resources to achieve the goals and carry out the action plans of this application:

a. There are seven separate categories of expenditures. Each cost was sufficiently described and costed out. The itemized descriptions reveal which are one-time investments as compared to ongoing recurring costs.

1. Learning for Students and Teachers: $5,173,511,03

2. Portals for Students and Parents: $1,742622.37

3. Transforming Learning and teaching: $4,624,372.42

4. 21st Centuray Digital Learmning and Teaching: $5,197,435.30

5. College and Career Ready: $8,068,121.54

6. Project Management: $3,492,384.41

7. Results, Resource Alignment Integrated Service: $1,450,000

,Other sources bring the total to $36,489,407.07.

It also shows that the total of participating students is 5,720.

The budget is sufficient for the purposes of the project. It details all internal and external costs (Phillips) associated with personnel and nonpersonnel costs. I identified costs that were one-time and those that were ongoing. However it did not adequately explain the fiscal sustainability related to personalized learning.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

RPS did not have a separate narrative to document its sustainability. The challenge was to locate any information related to sustainability without inference. RSP states that the proposed project is designed for sustainability.That is the extent of any discussion regarding sustainability.Conclusion: RPS did not adequately respond to sustainability.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**7**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

RPS and CISR (Community in Service-Richmond) have established a strong data-driven partnership that represents one of the more productive relationships dealing with non-school factors:

RPS proposes to continue, in partnership, with an organization, CIS of Richmond (CISR). The basic supports involve: safety, caring adults, healthy starts, career skills, community service.

CISR and RPS will have a system of collecting the necessary data for the services provided and their effects on a range of student needs.

CIS of Richmond bridges with all the schools and the community to deal with accessing a range of services – mentoring, tutoring, health care, summer and after-school programs, family counseling, service learning etc.

CISR works with school staff directly to create and understanding of the nonschool factors and how they can support family and student as CISR leverage for a range of community support. However, the engagement with school staff needed to be more adequately described to comprehend the capacity building of school staff could be achieved.

An assessment program complements the services.CISR and RPS coordinate the inventorying of needs and resources. An established decisionmaking system is part of the partnership. Families and students are directly involved. Goals for the engagement of all stakeholders such as families needed further development.

Goals have been established and are continuously monitored. However without a baseline to compare current performances to future performances, it cannot be determined if these are appropriately ambitious.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The RPS application represents an ambitious but achievable project.
1. It has demonstrated that it is engaged stakeholders and they participated in the creation of the project.
2. The reform model of PLE was well understood by RPS and was embedded into the overall Project strategy.
3. RPS constructed a complex set of action plans that reflected the goals of RTTT-D for PLE, accelerated and deepening achievement, improving graduation rates, and improving college and postsecondary enrollment.
4. The Project management component established the mechanisms for monitoring progress and continuously improving the effort.
5. The professional development of teachers, principals was extensive outlined in the action plans to ensure that implementation was possible.
6. The budget was a reasonable projection of costs that would achieve the goals through the human and materials acquired and developed.
7. The sustainability of the project was evident due to the commitment to professional development, the technology, management, and partnerships.
8. The external partnership was a very viable one that experienced success in the past and is a match for this project.

Total	210	155

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

there are no optional budgets

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1328VA-3 for Richmond Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant's vision for the transformation of RPS is wide-ranging and accurately acknowledges that such reform will require more than what RttT-D can provide. The applicant appears to propose to use RttT-D funds to support part of its larger reform efforts.
- Because the narrative devotes considerable space to describing an overall reform plan for RMS middle and high schools, it is difficult to distinguish at first which components of reform mentioned in this section make up RMS's RttT-D plan, and which are part of that larger RMS reform plan
- The five-point middle/high reform plan (and the pieces that appear to be included in the RttT-D plan) includes: 1) development of a Personalized Learning System [RttT-D: expansion portals for students, parents]; 2) expansion of AP focus to include Pre-AP strategies [RttT-D: expansion of courses offered]; 3) application of a STEM focus in middle grades [RttT-D: not included]; 4) inclusion or expansion (not clear) of Gifted Education strategies [RttT-D: not included]; and 5) instruction geared toward College Readiness and Preparation [RttT-D: partnership with community college]. In addition, the narrative indicates that RMS is moving toward installation of a coordinated, interoperable LMS, and there is also mention of RMS University (undefined/unexplained) and its expansion.
- The applicant's narrative then begins to explicate which elements of the overall reform plan are included in its RttT-D proposal, and how those connect directly to the four assurance areas:
  - Standards and Assessment: a) AP Expansion; b) College/Career Readiness Project; c) College/Career Coaches
  - Data Systems: d) Student and Parent Portals for Student Data Management System
  - Effective Teachers and Leaders: e) Personalized Learning Training Project; f) 21st Century Digital Learning/Teaching Project
  - Turnaround of Lowest-Performing Schools: All of the above
- Because the larger plan touches on so many different areas of education reform, and because the various elements to be supported by RttT-D also are wide-ranging, it is difficult to ascertain whether the plan as presented here is credible or achievable, or whether it instead promises more than RMS can reasonably accomplish

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant identifies all of its middle and high schools for participation in the activities outlined in the proposal, as well as the rationale for their selection
- Applicant indicates that all students in every school are high-need, but does not clarify how it came to this conclusion – application lacks detail regarding what factor(s) suggest that all schools are high-need

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant includes some elements related to this criterion in its narrative for Section (A)(1) (including an overarching but underdeveloped statement of a theory of change), but with no detailed text or schematics included for this section, it is difficult to make an assessment of the degree to which the applicant has a high-quality plan for implementation or for scaling beyond middle and high schools
- There is, however, somewhat stronger -- if indirect -- evidence for how the applicant's RttT-D plans support overall efforts in RPS, as indicated in appendix items such as the applicant's Balanced Scorecard and Strategic Plan

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant provides targets across several measures
- Without a narrative to explain the rationale behind the targets chosen, however, it is difficult to assess either their reasonableness or likelihood of being achievable
- All projections are ambitious, and some seem achievable, but because all end with each sub-group at the same point of achievement by the end of the grant period (essentially eliminating all gaps), some stretch credibility alongside more modest goals (e.g., high school reading targets for all sub-groups is 99% by grant end, regardless of where each sub-group started; gap closures of up to and over 50 percentage points; graduation rates at 80% for all groups in four years, even for those starting at or below 40%)

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- By the applicant's own admission, little to no progress has been made in improvement of student achievement or gap closure over the past few years (information is provided for only the past two years in most cases), and the applicant has not provided any supporting data tables
- This section of the application also provides no discussion of past successful reform efforts; however, the reform work noted in Section (A)(1), coupled with the larger Strategic Plan into which the applicant's RttT-D proposed activities would fit, suggests that the proposal is part of an effort already under way (even if not yet for the past four or more years)
- The applicant provides no information about data availability for students, educators, or other stakeholders

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant indicates in the narrative that all required disaggregated budget information is available on the RPS website
- Though there are no examples of data that address sub-criteria (a) through (d) provided in the application or in an Appendix, the applicant does provide specific information about the location of all required financial information in the applicant's annual Financial Report.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant cites as evidence of the presence of a state context supportive of implementation that the proposal has been reviewed by state entities; the Appendix includes a statement by a RPS associate superintendent that the proposal does not violate any state or federal laws, and it also includes a letter from the Office of the State Superintendent that indicates a general agreement with that assessment.
- It should be noted, however, that the Virginia Department of Education also suggested that RPS request a more thorough review from local entities to ensure that the specifics of the application do not violate any state or federal

statutes; there is no evidence of such a review.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- In the Appendix, there is a letter of support from the Mayor; no other letters of support from local agencies or citizens is included
- There is a letter from the College Board in support of the proposal
- Parent, student, and other stakeholder involvement in the development of the proposal is noted in the narrative, but the extent of that involvement appears to have been during some of the stages of the development of RPS's larger reform vision, not specifically for this proposal
- No evidence of teacher support has been provided

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant includes a gap-analysis chart in its Appendix (the Virginia School Report Card data for the LEA for 2012)
- The narrative implies that its Technology Resources unit will help to determine gaps and needs in technology, but the narrative predominantly discusses this unit's role in providing support
- Applicant indicates that it will rely on to-be-hired consultants to identify additional needs and gaps to be addressed by the plan
- Much of the narrative for this section shares descriptions of examples of current school programs without tying the information directly to the criterion
- Applicant references its 2005 "New Direction" work for reforming the LEA as evidence of the logic behind the current proposal; inclusion of information from this work would have strengthened this aspect of the proposal

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- This section provides a descriptive overview of each of the applicant's proposed plan components
- Rather than developing a way for all of the elements of the plan to work together seamlessly, the approach appears to be to offer several different mini-projects, some of which are directly related to each other (e.g., Personalized Learning Coaches and SDMS) and others of which are related only by the meta-goal of improvement in student achievement
- Overall, applicant's narrative for this section is closer to the level of *vision* than to the level of specifics about plan actualization. Inclusion of a chart that breaks down each initiative into discrete chunks and provides pacing is helpful, but some elements (particularly with respect to pacing) seem unlikely (e.g., in the first two months of the grant period, the applicant proposes to fully staff and fully develop all of the infrastructure necessary to carry out its Pre-AP plan; 8 months for development, installation, and testing of entire SDLS; 2 months to staff and develop the Personalize Learning Training program, etc.)
- Applicant's main narrative provides evidence that its plan—if fully realized—will fully meet 4 of the 12 components of this criterion ((C)(1)(a)(ii) via AP project, College and Career Readiness project, CCR Coaches; (C)(1)(b)(i) via SDMS [implied], CCR Coaches; (C)(1)(b)(iv)(A) via SDMS Portals project; and (C)(1)(b)(iv)(B) via CCR Coaches)
- Applicant's narrative—if fully realized—indicates that the applicant will partially meet 5 others:
  - (C)(1)(a)(i) – Sole responsibility for this component appears to rest on the shoulders of the CCR Coaches
  - (C)(1)(a)(iii) – Pursuit of Pre-AP/AP coursework implies that deep learning experiences will be available, but there is little discussion of what those might look like or how they will be assured
  - (C)(1)(a)(v) – Applicant states that mastery of academic content and skill development will result from the Pre-AP/AP project and personalized learning (which appears to be primarily distribution of devices) but does not indicate how that will transpire

- - - (C)(1)(b)(iii) – Again, the inclusion of the Pre-AP/AP project implies high-quality content, but there is no evidence provided to verify this implication
    - (C)(1)(c) – Applicant intends to provide IT support to teachers and parents for use of devices; much more training (for students in particular) across all of the projects will be necessary in order to fully meet this sub-criterion
  - Three sub-criteria were not met in the main narrative:
    - (C)(1)(a)(iv) – Applicant indicates that some of its initiatives will make exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives possible without offering a compelling explanation for how that will happen
    - (C)(1)(b)(ii) – The narrative does not provide detail about the variety of high-quality instructional approaches that will be used; the only approach noted is the Pre-AP/AP approach
    - (C)(1)(b)(v) – The narrative includes no details about accommodations for high-need students
- In sum, evidence of a focus on the mechanics of *how* each component of the proposal will translate into *individualization of instruction* has been missing throughout most of the proposal to this point, and this section provides the best opportunity to address that gap. However, the **main narrative** does not provide much more specific detail about how most of the components will contribute to this desired outcome. For example, the proposal states: "Students will create *learner profiles* based on their strengths, talents, passions and interests and link them to college and career ready standards and graduation requirements. . . . They will work with teachers and Career Coaches to *develop a personalized sequence of instructional content* to develop and ensure they will meet their learning goals"—both of which are good starting points, but neither of which clearly identifies how either product will be used by students and/or teachers to create the desired personalized learning environment. What, for instance, might a personalized sequence of instructional content look like, and how will RPS be reorganized to allow students to pursue those individualized sequences?
- That said, the applicant then includes a **very detailed, carefully crafted, and fully budgeted "sample" 4-year plan for creating a personalized learning environment** in the Appendix, referenced briefly in one of the cells in the table provided with this section. It is not clear why this very detailed Appendix item is only a *sample*. Why is it not *the* plan for at least some of the aspects of (C)(1), such as the development of applicant's proposed Personalize Learning Training (and for at least some of (C)(2), for that matter)? More explanation of the context for and intended use of this Appendix section likely would strengthen not only the narrative for this section but also the overall application
- (Applicant's main narrative is repeated twice in the body of the proposal (pp. 63-70))

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Overall, the applicant's narrative for this section lacks the detail and depth necessary to determine whether the applicant's plan will fully realize the scope of this criterion. As in (C)(1), the applicant's narrative for this section again remains largely at the level of vision rather than actualization
- This criterion is largely about the degree to which the applicant provides the *training and support*, *resources*, and *leadership* necessary for teachers and leaders to grow professionally in ways that will support the proposed work. For the most part, instead of outlining this training, support, and resources, the applicant uses this space only to declare that the qualities, activities, and supports outlined in the criterion will be present
- Applicant's narrative fully meets only 1of the 10 components of this criterion: (C)(2)(c)(i) via value-added work and TIF grant work
- Applicant's narrative partially meets 3 others: (C)(2)(b)(i) through (iii) – All three are declared and are connected to other areas of the proposal, but the narrative provides little information about how these three resources will be realized, managed, and linked
- All other sub-criteria either are not addressed at all ((C)(2)(c)(ii)) or were not met:
  - For example, for (C)(2)(d), the plan addresses issues of qualification only; no indication of how teacher evaluation and student outcomes data could be used to aid in decision-making about staffing and teacher placement. Applicant implies that "highly qualified" is synonymous with "highly effective."

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant does not provide detailed information about how the LEA's practices, policies, and rules facilitate any of the five sub-criteria for this criterion
- The applicant does provide some support for the appropriateness of the organization of the central office to support the work; information provided about support for special needs and other special populations is thorough and laudable, but it is not linked clearly to the personalization work outlined in this proposal
- Dual enrollment is not equivalent to mastery learning and progression, nor is exclusive reliance on state tests a measure of mastery assessment; there is also no indication of school-level autonomy other than a declaration that it exists

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant's proposal includes accommodations for providing an interoperable data system, along with a promise of data exportable in an open format, pending award
- Providing technical support through coaches only does not appear to cover provision of such support across all stakeholders, nor are any details provided with respect to how those coaches will fill this role
- Provision of portals alone is not sufficient for guaranteeing stakeholder access to all of the content, tools, and other learning resources outlined in the proposal; provision of Internet connectivity, or at the least publicly-available physical portals also would need to be provided

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant provides a vetted framework for its continuous improvement process (Poister 2010)
- The plan mentions sharing data on a quarterly basis with "key decision-making groups," and the text suggests that these will be both internal and external (e.g., the evaluation group at VCU)
- It is not clear from the narrative the extent to which this improvement process will continue after the grant period
- Details about venues and methods for sharing results publicly are thin; the narrative only mentions that it will happen and (roughly) how often it is likely to happen

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- There is no text provided specifically for this criterion regarding a strategy for communicating and engaging with external stakeholders
- There is, however, some discussion in the preceding section ((E)(1)) about information dissemination to both internal and external stakeholders as part of the continuous improvement plan, as well as a surface-level description incorporated into the overall evaluation narrative

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant provides a very comprehensive and appropriately diverse list of measures
- Particularly impressive is the inclusion of student climate surveys (Gallup student poll, College and Career Readiness survey, school climate survey)
- With the exception of the inclusion of targets of Measurement 7 (advanced proficiency in math and reading, grades 6-12), the application does not include examples of the surveys, any baseline values for any of the other proposed

measures, or annual or end-grant targets for any of the other measures. Such information for the measures specified is not included in the tables provided in (A)(4), either

- There is a promise to refine the proposed measures without any detail about how that refinement will unfold

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant does not provide separate and distinct text for this criterion, but the description of the evaluation plan outlined in (E)(1) provides sufficient detail to determine that the evaluation plan addresses this criterion
- For example, RSD's implementation of a Balanced Scorecard approach to district management and its Program Logic Model template (both provided in appendices) will provide a solid framework for supporting decision-making about ways to restructure time and resources as the proposed plan rolls out, once plan elements are added to the Scorecard process and are provided their own dedicated Program Logic Model documentation
- In addition, applicant states (earlier) that it will contract with Virginia Commonwealth University to provide external evaluation services centered on performance data analysis (a healthy list of which are provided as part of the applicant's response to (E)(3), as noted earlier)

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant notes an impressive array of outside funds (over $6.6 million [reviewer's calculation]) that will be brought to bear to support proposal implementation; the narrative does not, however, identify where those funds come from, or the degree to which any of them is likely to recur after the grant period
- Applicant identifies the amount—if not the source (see note above and (F)(2))—of all funds that will support this project, as well as how and where they will be applied
- There are several aspects of the budget that appear to be under-developed and/or that would benefit from additional explanations, namely:
  - AP expansion sub-budget appears to be incorrectly calculated. Applicant calculates weekly hours (2 hours x 4 days a week) and multiplies by total sessions (x 27); unless a "session" = a week of service instead of a day, this equation multiplies by days twice. Annual cost would be $10,206 instead of $40,824. If, however, a "session" = a week, then the applicant's calculations are correct but unclearly labeled.
  - There are several potentially defendable components in the budget that are lacking supporting narratives to make the case for their inclusion; among them:
    - Applicant sets aside near $1 million for upgrades to middle and high school science labs; while not unreasonable in the abstract, the application would benefit from more detail about how these funds will be used
    - Applicant's significant investment in AP is not surprising, given applicant's proposal; such a significant investment probably should come with at least some consideration for evaluating this specific investment via the applicant's evaluation plan
    - Budget includes monetary rewards ($90,000) for students who receive a 3 or higher on the AP exam; again, while this concept in the abstract may be defensible, such a controversial plan deserves at least some mention in the narrative
    - Development of student and parent access portals tops $1.3 million, also an expense that would benefit from greater detail to justify the amount, especially given that the *entire* cost for this component is $2.5 million (when the portion of that component paid for by outside sources is included)
    - Budget includes $1.7 million for summer work stipends for students under the College and Career Ready project, but there is no indication of details about this program in the applicant's main narrative
- Evaluation budget at 4% of the entire budget is appropriate for a proposal of this size
- (Applicant includes a budget for the Student and Parent Portals twice; while it is not totaled twice in the overall budget, its inclusion above the summary of the full budget was distracting at first)

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant has outlined a process for developing a plan for sustaining the work after the grant period ends, though the narrative mostly uses the text of the grant application to label what the workgroup will do
- Applicant makes clear that project sustainability will depend on ongoing support from a multitude of local and state agencies, and there is a series of statements from various local organizations outlining estimated equivalent dollar amounts of the services they provide RPS, though these statement are not all directly supportive of specific elements of RPS's RttT-D proposal; rather, they are more often demonstrative of general support for RPS
- Support from state and local government leaders is sparse, with only a letter of support from the Mayor of Richmond
- There appears to be a significant amount of human resources costs for a significant number of positions outlined in this budget, but no indication of which or how any of these positions will continue to be funded after the grant (other than the general statement about likely support from local and state agencies)

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- The RPS proposal to expand the services of Communities in Schools-Richmond clearly meets most of the criteria for the Competitive Preference Priority
- Much of the strength of the work is based on the past successes of CIS-Richmond, which does appear to have been quite successful
- Though the narrative does not directly or explicitly address each of the aspects of this criterion, the overall proposal, coupled with past successes, suggests that the planned expansion of CIS-Richmond stands a good chance of success and will be an integrated component of the overall RPS mission and vision
- This text also is repeated twice in the application; again, not detrimental to the overall argument, but it does make the application more difficult to parse

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- The absolute priority is met via the overriding goals of the five programmatic components of the plan
- As noted throughout the comments above, the plan appears to be under-developed (or even undeveloped) in several places and is missing details about *how* many of the plans will be put into action, but the overall *intent* of the proposal meets the elements of the Absolute Priority

Total	210	110